RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 07 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 were examined in the Office Action mailed March 7, 2006. Claims 6-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as indefinite. Claims 1-3 stand rejected as anticipated by *Mote, Jr.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,805,609). Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected as rendered obvious by *Mote, Jr.* in view of IEEE 1149.1 standard, based on a contention that this IEEE standard is analogous art.

Claims 6 and 23 are amended above. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of these amendments and the remarks which follow.

A. § 112 Rejection of Claims 6-12 is Addressed.

The indefiniteness rejection of claims 6-12 has been addressed by the amendments above to claim 6, wherein the term "respectively" has been added to clarify the connections, consistent with the circuitry shown in Figs. 4-5. Claim 6 has also been amended to correct an informality. No new matter is added thereby. This amendment also addresses the § 112 rejection to claims 7-12, arising from dependency on claim 6.

Claim 12 has been amended to properly conform to Fig. 5.

All of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 have been addressed specifically, or inferentially by being dependent upon an allowable base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-12 is therefore respectfully requested.

B. § 102(b) Rejection of Claims 1-3 over *Mote* is Addressed.

The anticipation rejection of claims 1-3 over *Mote* is mooted by the cancellation of claims 1-3.

C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 4 and 5 over *Mote* is Addressed.

The obvious rejection of claims 4 and 5 over *Mote* is mooted by the cancellation of claims 4 and 5.

D. New Claims 13-22 are Presented for Examination.

New claims 13-22 are presented for examination. Support for claims 13-22 is found in an inspection of Figs. 4 and 5, and corresponding specification description, as well as in original claims 6-12. Claim 13 is distinguishable over *Mote* as claiming

a specific boundary scan test circuit topology that is not taught or suggested by *Mote*, which includes

> a first multiplexer circuit for receiving a core logic input signal and a shift/capture control signal;
> a capture register circuit coupled to the first multiplexer circuit;
> an update register circuit coupled to the capture register circuit;
> a second multiplexer circuit coupled to the update register circuit for receiving a mode control signal; and
> a buffer coupled to the second multiplexer circuit and to a pad.

Since this combination of features is neither taught nor suggested by *Mote*, claim 13 (and dependent claims 14-22 which contain these features through dependence from claim 13), are patentably distinguishable over *Mote*.

E. Petition for 1-Month Extension.

Applicant hereby petitions for a one-month extension, from June 7, 2006 to July 7, 2006 in which to respond to the Office Action. Please charge Deposit Account No. 50-1123 the $120.00 large entity 1-month extension fee and any additional fees associated with this transmittal.

F. Conclusion.

In view of the above amendments, claims 6-22 are in form for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is kindly asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

July 7, 2006

Carol W. Burton, Reg. No. 35,465
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, CO 80202
Telephone: (303) 454-2454
Facsimile: (303) 899-7333